The Israelite Conquest of Canaan: Historical Boundaries, Ancient Near Eastern Historiography, and Theological Typology

Introduction to the Conquest Narratives

The biblical narrative detailing the Israelite conquest of Canaan presents one of the most rigorously debated historical, geopolitical, and theological constructs within ancient historiography. For centuries, historians, archaeologists, and biblical exegetes have grappled with the apparent tension—and frequently perceived contradiction—between explicit summary statements of total, unqualified victory under the leadership of Joshua and simultaneous admissions within the very same texts that vast tracts of land and numerous indigenous populations remained unconquered[1]. Passages such as Joshua 10:40-43, 11:16-23, and 21:43-45 seem to summarize an exhaustive, sweeping military annihilation of the Canaanite inhabitants. Yet, immediately juxtaposed are statements in Joshua 13 and Judges 1 that describe a heavily entrenched indigenous population, enduring Canaanite fortresses, and an incomplete settlement mandate[1].

Traditional historical-critical approaches have frequently attributed this tension to the clumsy redaction of disparate sources across multiple centuries. In these diachronic frameworks, scholars often suggest that a later Deuteronomistic editor inserted idealistic, hyperbolic summaries of a complete conquest that never historically materialized, awkwardly pasting them alongside older, more historically accurate accounts of a slow, tribal infiltration[1]. However, modern synchronic readings and advancements in the study of Ancient Near Eastern (ANE) literary genres invite a far more sophisticated approach, recognizing that the text operates with a high degree of internal logic when evaluated against the linguistic conventions of its era[1].

This report provides an exhaustive executive summary of T.A. Clarke's critical evaluation of the complete versus incomplete conquest tension. Building upon this textual foundation, the report utilizes a structured, algorithmic logic to propose an independent historical and theological reconciliation of the conquest's scope, integrating the broader hegemonic achievements of the later Davidic and Solomonic empires to resolve geographical discrepancies. Finally, the analysis pivots from historical geography to biblical theology, assessing how the typological framework of Hebrews 3 and 4 reinterprets the physical dimensions of the Old Covenant conquest into an eschatological, spiritual fulfillment in Christ.

Executive Summary: Complete vs. Incomplete Conquest

In the scholarly discourse surrounding the book of Joshua, the starting point for most commentary is the perceived contradiction between the sweeping summary statements of total victory and the immediate contextual admissions of an incomplete campaign[1]. T.A. Clarke's research addresses this tension not by resorting to source-critical fragmentation or dismissing the text as mere ideological irony, but through a meticulous, close reading of the Hebrew text in three primary summary passages: Joshua 10:40-43, 11:16-23, and 21:43-45[1]. The analysis reveals that the biblical narrator explicitly circumscribes the conquest, carefully communicating a substantially complete, yet geographically and demographically limited, military success.

The Southern Campaign Summary (Joshua 10:40-43)

The summary of Joshua's southern campaign begins with the statement that Joshua "struck the whole land." A cursory reading in translation suggests absolute regional domination. However, Clarke demonstrates that the author immediately qualifies the phrase "the whole land" with an appositional list of specific geographical zones: the hill country, the Negev, the lowland, and the slopes[1]. Conspicuously absent from this list is the coastal plain[1]. By comparing this localized list to the broader parameters of the Promised Land outlined in Deuteronomy 1:7 (which explicitly includes the seacoast), it becomes evident that the narrator is carefully limiting the extent of Joshua's victory. The text claims total victory only within a highly localized theater of operations[1].

Furthermore, Clarke addresses the statement that Joshua left "no survivors" and destroyed "everything that breathed" (Joshua 10:40). The pronominal suffix in the Hebrew phrase "all their kings" points strictly to the specific kings of the aforementioned sub-regions, deliberately excluding the Philistine pentapolis and major fortress cities like Gezer and Jerusalem[1]. While the king of Jerusalem was defeated in the field at Gibeon, the Jebusite city itself was not structurally reduced or occupied during this campaign[1].

Additionally, Clarke highlights a crucial morphological and strategic distinction regarding the Hebrew verbs *nakah* (to strike/defeat militarily) and *lakad* (to capture). The text indicates that the Israelites struck and captured these territories, but crucially, it omits the verb *yarash* (to take possession of or occupy) when describing the western campaigns[1]. The Israelite militia rapidly attacked these centers "at one time" (*pa'am ehat*, indicating a singular, contiguous campaign rather than sudden magic) and subsequently retreated to their base camp at Gilgal

(Joshua 10:43)[1]. Because the cities were captured but not demographically occupied, displaced indigenous populations undoubtedly reoccupied them following the Israelite withdrawal. This seamlessly explains why cities like Debir and Hebron, struck by Joshua, had to be recaptured later by the tribe of Judah during the settlement phase (Judges 1:11)[1].

The Northern Campaign and Macro-Summary (Joshua 11:16-23)

Similarly, the summary of the northern campaign states that "Joshua took all this land" (Joshua 11:16a). Clarke observes that the near demonstrative adjective "this" modifies the noun phrase, restricting the referent to the immediate appositional list of seven territories that follows—five southern and two northern[1]. The geographical boundaries are explicitly marked from Mount Halak in the south to Baal Gad in the Valley of Lebanon in the north[1]. This delineates a massive conquest, yet it falls hundreds of kilometers short of the Euphrates River—the ultimate northern boundary promised to the patriarchs in Genesis 15:18-21 and Joshua 1:4[1]. The biblical narrator is keenly aware that the original covenantal land grant has not been exhausted.

To further defuse the charge of contradiction, Clarke points to the Hebrew literary convention of making an absolute statement followed by a qualification[1]. By examining parallel syntactical structures across Israel's primary history (such as 1 Kings 3:3, which states Solomon was entirely obedient *except* regarding the high places), it becomes clear that biblical authors utilized exception clauses to signify an action that is substantially, but not absolutely, complete[1]. In Joshua 11, the text states a comprehensive victory but immediately utilizes exceptions—namely, the survival of the Gibeonites via treaty and the enduring presence of the Anakites in Philistine territory[1].

The Final Settlement Summary (Joshua 21:43-45)

The most frequently cited text by proponents of the contradiction theory is Joshua 21:43-45, which asserts that the Lord gave Israel "all the land" sworn to their fathers, that they possessed it, and that "not one man out of all their enemies stood before them"[1]. Clarke reconciles this by appealing to the original conditional parameters of the promise articulated to the preceding generation in Exodus 23:20-33. In Exodus, Yahweh explicitly warned that He would drive out the inhabitants *in stages* ("little by little"), rather than all at once, to prevent the land from becoming desolate and overrun by wild animals[1].

Therefore, Joshua 21:43-45 functions as a theological evaluation declaring that

God has faithfully executed the *first phase* of the Exodus 23 paradigm. The claim that no enemy "stood before them" (utilizing the partitive preposition "out of") means that no specific enemy coalition was capable of halting the Israelite military advance; it does not claim that every single enemy combatant was actively hunted down and killed[1]. Clarke concludes that a precise, grammatically sensitive reading of the Hebrew text removes the necessity of appealing to conflicting redactional sources, revealing a coherent narrative of a substantially complete, yet phased and ongoing, conquest[1].

An Algorithmic Proposition: Reconciling the Scope of the Conquest

While Clarke's syntactical analysis expertly reconciles the internal tensions within the book of Joshua, an independent, systemic proposition is required to fully harmonize the broader historical and geographic realities of Israel's occupation. The biblical record stretches from the initial incursions under Joshua (c. 1400 BC) through the zenith of the United Monarchy under David and Solomon (c. 1000 BC)[2]. By processing the biblical data, archaeological records, and ANE literary conventions through a logical matrix, a tripartite framework emerges that effectively resolves the perceived historical paradoxes regarding the scope of Israel's conquest.

Variable A: The Application of Ancient Near Eastern Military Historiography

To evaluate the historical claims of Joshua accurately, the text must be calibrated against the literary conventions of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages. Extrabiblical texts from neighboring empires uniformly employ highly stylized, hyperbolic rhetoric to describe military victories[5]. When the biblical text states that the enemy was "in number like the sand on the seashore" (Joshua 11:4) or that Joshua left "no survivors," it is employing standard ANE military idiom, not modern statistical demographic data[5].

Furthermore, the concept of *herem* (the "ban" or devotion to destruction) is frequently misunderstood by modern readers as a mandate for absolute, comprehensive genocide. However, archaeological and epigraphic evidence indicates this was a shared regional ideology denoting decisive, divinely sanctioned victory, typically localized to specific military and administrative strongholds[11].

The moral justification for this severe action is repeatedly linked in the biblical text to the Canaanites' depraved religious practices, most notably rampant child

sacrifice, which rendered the culture irredeemable under theocratic law[16].

The hyperbolic nature of ANE conquest accounts is well-documented and provides the necessary hermeneutical key for reading Joshua:

Extra-Biblical Source	Date	Hyperbolic / Herem Claims	Historical Reality
Merneptah Stele (Egypt)	c. 1208 BC	Pharaoh Merneptah boasts: "Israel is laid waste, his seed is not."[14]	Israel survived the campaign, flourished, and established a powerful monarchy shortly after.[14]
Mesha Stele (Moab)	c. 840 BC	King Mesha devoted the Israelite town of Nebo to destruction (*herem*), claiming Israel "utterly perished forever."[11]	Israel continued to exist as a powerful regional kingdom; the claim was ideological, not absolute.[11]
Annals of Mursili II (Hittite)	14th Century BC	Claims to have completely annihilated enemies and campaigned across vast distances in a single day.[6]	The text uses highly repetitive formulaic rhetoric meant to glorify the king and deity, masking drawn-out conflicts.[6]

Tiglath-Pileser I (Assyria)	c. 1100 BC	Claims to have covered hundreds of miles in one day, fighting multiple battles and leaving no survivors.[6]	Geographically and logistically impossible; utilized standard hyperbolic military braggadocio.[6]

When algorithmic logic applies the ANE literary coefficient to the book of Joshua, the claims of "total destruction" are recognized as genre-specific idioms for "decisive, overwhelming victory"[5].

The military infrastructure of the Canaanite city-states was effectively shattered, even if the vast majority of the peasant population survived and fled to the surrounding countryside[11].

Variable B: The Strategic Distinction Between Conquest, Occupation, and Hegemony

The apparent contradiction regarding territorial extent is resolved by tracking a linear, three-phased evolution of territorial acquisition from Joshua to David.

1. The Strategic Conquest (Joshua, c. 1406–1400 BC): Joshua's campaigns were largely disabling strikes against major military coalitions—namely, the southern alliance at Gibeon and the northern alliance at the Waters of Merom[2]. Joshua destroyed the offensive capabilities of the Canaanites, but he burned only three key administrative/military centers to the ground: Jericho, Ai, and Hazor[3].

The theater of this conquest was limited primarily to the central highlands and the Negev, covering approximately 10,000 square miles[2].

This established a secure beachhead for the Israelites, but it did not result in the demographic replacement of the lowlands, coastal plains, or major valleys (such as the Jezreel Valley), which remained heavily fortified. The Canaanites retained technological parity in these flatter regions due to their mastery of chariot warfare[2]. Crucially, major strategic cities like Jerusalem remained securely in Jebusite hands (Joshua 15:63)[2].

2. The Tribal Occupation (Judges, c. 1399–1050 BC): Following Joshua's death, the national strategy fractured. The mandate shifted from unified military campaigns to decentralized tribal settlement, coordinated from the tabernacle base at Shiloh[8]. This phase was defined by varying degrees of failure as individual tribes attempted to clear their allotted territories of indigenous populations and establish a sedentary agricultural presence[2]. The Canaanites, Jebusites, and Philistines continued to exert heavy influence, resulting in syncretism and fulfilling the divine warning that disobedience would result in the indigenous people becoming "thorns" in Israel's side[2].

3. The Imperial Hegemony (David and Solomon, c. 1000–930 BC): The total geographic extent of the covenant promises given to Abraham (Genesis 15:18-21) and Moses (Numbers 34) was not realized during the lifetimes of Moses or Joshua.

The borders were projected to stretch from the "River of Egypt" (likely the Wadi el-Arish) in the south to the great river Euphrates in the north, enclosing roughly 300,000 square kilometers—a landmass comparable to modern Italy[10]. The parameters of this grand land grant were teleological, anticipating the zenith of Israelite geopolitical power.

Under King David, the United Monarchy finally conquered the enduring enclaves within the highlands, most notably wrestling Jerusalem from the Jebusites (2 Samuel 5:6-10)[2]. David expanded Israel's tributary control and geopolitical hegemony far beyond the immediate settlement[24].

First Kings 4:21-24 explicitly notes that his successor, Solomon, reigned over all the kingdoms from the Euphrates River to the land of the Philistines, as far as the border of Egypt[23]. Thus, the geographic promise was not a failure of Joshua's era; it was a multi-generational project that achieved its historical climax under the Davidic dynasty.

Variable C: Archaeological Corroboration of the Settlement

To ground this phased matrix, objective material evidence must be consulted. While late 19th and early 20th-century archaeology often sought widespread destruction layers to validate a rapid, total conquest, modern archaeology aligns far better with the biblical model of a localized highland conquest followed by gradual infiltration[3].

Archaeological Discovery	Date	Relevance to the Israelite Conquest/Settlement
Amarna Letters (Egypt)	Mid-14th Century BC	Diplomatic correspondence from Canaanite mayors pleading for Egyptian help against *Hapiru* (Habiru) raiders in the highlands, aligning perfectly with the instability of the early Judges period following Joshua's strikes.[18]
Deir 'Alla Inscription (Jordan)	c. 1400–1200 BC	A plaster text explicitly naming "Balaam son of Beor," confirming the presence of Yahweh-aware, Semitic populations in Transjordanian territory precisely when the biblical text places the tribes of Reuben and Gad there.[19]
Gilgal Footprint Enclosures	Early Iron Age	Five foot-shaped stone enclosures found in the Jordan Valley, matching the exact dimensions and orientation for cultic gatherings, physically corroborating the Israelite staging grounds (*gilgalim*)

		described in Joshua.[19]

The Synthesis Matrix Conclusion

By algorithmically reconciling these variables, the independent proposition holds that there is no historical contradiction within the text. Joshua successfully achieved the initial strategic mandate of breaking Canaanite suzerainty and establishing an Israelite highland presence (Conquest)[2]. The book of Judges accurately records the protracted, multi-generational struggle of demographic transition (Occupation)[2]. Finally, the historical books of Samuel and Kings demonstrate the ultimate realization of the maximal territorial boundaries promised in the Abrahamic covenant (Hegemony)[10]. The biblical text operates with high internal coherence when the distinction between an initial military victory, sustained tribal settlement, and subsequent imperial consolidation is acknowledged.

Typological and Spiritual Fulfillment: The Exegesis of Hebrews 3 and 4

Having established the physical, historical, and geopolitical parameters of the conquest, a comprehensive analysis requires shifting to the domain of biblical theology. Specifically, how does the New Testament, notably the Epistle to the Hebrews, appropriate the historical events of the conquest? Does the physical occupation of Canaan represent the ultimate fulfillment of the covenant, or does it serve as an earthly, typological shadow of a cosmic, spiritual reality?

The Linguistic and Typological Connection: Joshua and Jesus

The typological connection between the Old Covenant conquest and New Covenant salvation is established at the most fundamental linguistic level. In the original Hebrew, the name of Moses' successor is *Yehoshua* (Joshua), meaning "Yahweh is salvation"[27]. When transliterated into Koine Greek (the language of the New Testament and the Septuagint), *Yehoshua* becomes *Iēsous*—the exact same name given to Jesus of Nazareth[28].

This linguistic unity has occasionally caused translation anomalies, most famously in the King James Version of Hebrews 4:8, which reads, "For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day"[28]. Modern translations uniformly render this as "Joshua," recognizing that the author of Hebrews is referencing the historical military leader of the conquest[28]. However,

the shared name is not merely a linguistic coincidence; it serves as a profound theological signpost[27]. Just as Joshua (the temporal savior) delivered the Israelites from the wilderness, defeated their physical enemies, and led them into the earthly inheritance of Canaan, Jesus (the eternal Savior) delivers believers from the bondage of sin, defeats spiritual enemies (sin and death), and leads His people into their eternal, heavenly inheritance[27].

Katapausis and Sabbatismos: The Nature of the Promised Rest

The central thesis of Hebrews 3 and 4 is the concept of "rest" (Greek: *katapausis*). The author reflects on the tragedy of the Exodus generation, whose unbelief and rebellion in the wilderness prevented them from entering the Promised Land—God's offered rest (Hebrews 3:16-19)[28]. The second generation, under the leadership of Joshua, successfully crossed the Jordan River and experienced a degree of this rest. Joshua 21:44 notes that "the Lord gave them rest on every side"[1].

However, the author of Hebrews employs a masterful theological argument to demonstrate the insufficiency and temporary nature of Joshua's geographic rest. Quoting Psalm 95 (written centuries after Joshua, during the Davidic era), the author notes that the Holy Spirit is *still* pleading with the people, saying, "Today, if you hear his voice, do not harden your hearts"[29]. The logical deduction is profound: if Joshua had provided the ultimate, teleological rest for the people of God, David would not have spoken centuries later about "another day" of rest that was still available and yet to be obtained[27].

Joshua's rest was an earthly, temporal reality contingent upon ongoing obedience[27]. It was a rest from physical warfare, but it could be lost through covenantal infidelity—a fact tragically demonstrated by the subsequent Assyrian and Babylonian exiles, during which the Israelites were violently evicted from the land[20]. Therefore, the physical conquest of Canaan was a typological shadow. It was the historical scaffolding upon which God was building a much grander eschatological reality[27]. To distinguish this ultimate spiritual rest from the temporal geographic rest of Canaan, the author of Hebrews shifts from the word *katapausis* to a unique term: *sabbatismos* (Sabbath-rest) in Hebrews 4:9[29]. This *sabbatismos* is not merely a cessation of physical migration; it is an entrance into the very rest of God Himself—the rest God enjoyed on the seventh day of creation[29]. It represents a completed work of redemption, an eternal state of grace, comfort, and holiness that cannot be forfeited to invading armies[29].

The Escalation of the Land Promise: Covenantal vs. Dispensational Frameworks

The transition from the geographic borders of the Old Covenant to the spiritual dimensions of the New Covenant forms the crux of a major theological debate regarding how to interpret the final fulfillment of the land promise[35].

Theological Framework	Interpretation of the Land Promise	View of Hebrews 3 & 4
Traditional Dispensationalism	The physical land promises made to Abraham regarding the specific borders of Canaan are unconditional and have never been completely fulfilled. Therefore, they demand a future, literal, geopolitical fulfillment for ethnic, national Israel during a future millennial reign.[37]	The spiritual rest offered in Christ applies to the Church, but it does not abrogate the necessity of a literal, territorial fulfillment for national Israel in the future.[37]
Covenant Theology	The biblical narrative operates via typological escalation. The physical land of Canaan was a microcosm. The promise to Abraham is expanded in the New Testament; as Paul states in Romans 4:13, Abraham is the "heir of the world," not just the Levant.[35]	Hebrews indicates that the land promise is fulfilled typologically in the heavenly realm that Christ entered, awaiting consummation in the New Creation where heaven and earth unite. Restoring physical borders would be a regression to shadows.[35]

The Epistle to the Hebrews strongly supports the escalatory view of Covenant Theology. It explicitly states that the patriarchs lived in tents in the land of promise as strangers, because they were "looking forward to the city with foundations, whose architect and builder is God" (Hebrews 11:10)[27]. They understood that the physical dirt of Canaan was a provisional placeholder intended to point backward to the lost paradise of Eden, and forward to the New Jerusalem[35]. To demand a return to the geopolitical borders of the Old Covenant, after Christ has inaugurated the New Covenant, would be a regression from the substance back to the shadow[37]. The physical, military realization of the borders under Joshua and David was a true and historically necessary phase of redemption, but its fully intended scope of spiritual fulfillment is realized only in the New Creation—the global, eternal Kingdom of God purchased by Christ[35].

Synthesis and Conclusion: Tying the Converging Themes Together

For the general reader navigating the complexities of the biblical text, the apparent discrepancies between Joshua's sweeping victories, the ongoing struggles of the Israelites, and the expansive territorial promises made by God can seem like an impenetrable historical and theological maze. However, when we tie these converging historical, linguistic, and spiritual themes together, a brilliantly cohesive picture emerges.

Resolving the Historical Battlefield

To understand the military accounts in the book of Joshua, it is highly useful to draw a parallel to major historical conflicts, such as the Allied invasion of Normandy during World War II. When the Allies successfully breached the beaches of Normandy, they dealt a fatal, strategic blow to the Axis powers in Western Europe. In a sweeping, definitive sense, the offensive capability of the enemy was broken, and the ultimate victory was secured. However, it would take many more months of brutal, house-to-house, town-by-town fighting to actually clear the territory, neutralize pockets of resistance, and secure peace.

Joshua’s campaign was the ancient equivalent of D-Day. He shattered the primary Canaanite military coalitions and established an undeniable stronghold in the highlands. When the biblical writers say he "utterly destroyed" the enemy and "took the whole land," they are utilizing the standard, boastful military language of their era—much like a modern sports fan might say, "We annihilated the opposing team." It meant a massive, decisive victory within a specific theater of war; it did not mean every single opposing civilian was literally wiped off the map. Joshua secured the strategic victory, but the individual Israelite tribes still had to move in,

clear the towns, and settle the land over the course of centuries (as detailed in the Book of Judges).

Ultimately, God's promise to give Israel a massive expanse of land—stretching all the way to the Euphrates River—was entirely fulfilled, but it took time. What began as a military beachhead under Joshua finally blossomed into a vast, powerful empire under King David and King Solomon hundreds of years later. History shows that God kept His geopolitical promises to the letter, utilizing a phased progression from conquest to occupation to hegemony.

Revealing the Spiritual Masterpiece

Yet, the Bible makes it clear that geopolitical borders and military victories were never the ultimate end goal. They were physical object lessons pointing toward a much greater spiritual reality.

Think of the physical land of Canaan like an architect's scale model of a beautiful mansion. The model is highly detailed, physical, and real—but it is meant only to help you envision the actual, full-sized home that is being built. The Israelites under Joshua fought violently to secure a patch of real estate where they could find physical rest from their enemies. But as the book of Hebrews points out, this physical rest was inherently fragile. It was temporary, easily disrupted by surrounding nations, and eventually lost when the people turned away from God and were exiled.

Because Joshua's earthly rest was imperfect, God promised "another day" of rest. This is where the profound connection between the two great leaders comes into focus. Joshua (whose name literally translates to Jesus in Greek) led God's people into a temporary, earthly promised land. Jesus Christ leads God's people into an eternal, spiritual promised land.

The fully intended scope of God's plan was not simply to give one ethnic group a strip of land in the Middle East. It was to use that physical land as a preview for the restoration of the entire world. The rest that Jesus offers—the *Sabbath-rest* for the soul—is a permanent peace with God, free from the striving of human effort and the endless warfare of sin. Therefore, the physical, military conquests of the Old Testament are not contradictory, nor are they the end of the story; they are the historical stepping stones that lead directly to the spiritual and eternal fulfillment found in Christ.

Works cited

1. Joshua's Incomplete Victory.pdf
2. Conquest Confusion At Yale | Associates For Biblical Research, https://biblearchaeology.org/research-articles/conquest-confusion-at-yale/
3. Archaeology's Lost Conquest | Answers in Genesis, https://answersingenesis.org/archaeology/archaeologys-lost-conquest/
4. Book of Joshua - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Book_of_Joshua
5. Joshua 10 and 11: Genre and hyperbole - Biblical Historical Context, https://biblicalhistoricalcontext.com/conquest-of-canaan/joshua-10-and-11-genre-and-hyperbole/
6. Joshua 10 and 11: Conclusion - Biblical Historical Context, https://biblicalhistoricalcontext.com/conquest-of-canaan/joshua-10-and-11-conclusion/
7. COMPLETE v. INCOMPLETE CONQUEST - Tyndale Bulletin, https://www.tyndalebulletin.org/article/29297-complete-v-incomplete-conquest-a-re-examination-of-three-passages-in-joshua.pdf
8. Allotment of the PROMISED LAND | Joshua 13-24; Conquest of Canaan; 12 Tribes Land Division; Israelite Settlements - GOD's WAR PLAN - Bible Battles & History, http://godswarplan.com/allotment-promised-land-joshua-13-24-conquest-canaan-12-tribes-land-division-israelite-settlements
9. The Conquest of Canaan | Desiring God, https://www.desiringgod.org/messages/the-conquest-of-canaan
10. How does Joshua 1:4 define the promised land's boundaries historically and geographically? - Bible Hub, https://biblehub.com/q/Joshua_1_4_Promised_land_boundaries.htm
11. The Problem of Warfare in the Book of Joshua | Zondervan Academic, https://zondervanacademic.com/blog/joshua-warfare
12. Map of the Twelve Tribes of Israel Joshua divides the land 1400 BC - Bible.ca, https://www.bible.ca/maps/bible-maps-master-index-borders-twelve-12-tribes

-israel-promised-land-joshua13-22-conquest-1400BC.htm

13. What does the Moabite Stone reveal about the Biblical revolt of the man Mesha?, https://christiananswers.net/q-abr/abr-a019.html

14. Joshua 10 and 11: Genre and Annihilation - Biblical Historical Context, https://biblicalhistoricalcontext.com/conquest-of-canaan/joshua-10-and-11-genre-and-annihilation/

15. Joshua's Wars of Conquest | Emergence Church - New Jersey, https://emergence.church/blog/2021/06/11/joshua-s-wars-of-conquest

16. The Problem of Joshua and the Conquest : r/Bible - Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/Bible/comments/y51iyd/the_problem_of_joshua_and_the_conquest/

17. Joshua's Conquest: Was It Justified? - North American Mission Board, https://www.namb.net/article/joshua-s-conquest-was-it-justified/

18. Extra-Biblical Evidence For The Conquest, https://biblearchaeology.org/research-articles/extrabiblical-evidence-for-the-conquest/

19. What historical evidence supports the events described in Joshua 22:9? - Bible Hub, https://biblehub.com/q/Evidence_for_Joshua_22_9_events.htm

20. Joshua & Judges and Work - Digital Commons @ SPU - Seattle Pacific University, https://digitalcommons.spu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1021&context=tow_project

21. From the River of Egypt to the Euphrates: The Geographic Reach of, https://uasvbible.org/2026/05/09/from-the-river-of-egypt-to-the-euphrates-the-geographic-reach-of-jehovahs-covenant-with-abram-genesis-1512-21/

22. From the River to the Sea - Israel My Glory, https://israelmyglory.org/article/from-the-river-to-the-sea/

23. Topical Bible: Extension of Boundaries, https://biblehub.com/topical/e/extension_of_boundaries.htm

24. Defining the Borders of the Land of Canaan – Numbers 34 - TheTorah.com, https://www.thetorah.com/article/defining-the-borders-of-the-land-of-canaan-

numbers-34

25. Did Israel possess all the promised territory? - The Narrow Path Ministries, https://theos.org/forum/viewtopic.php?t=5199

26. Have the Archaeological Giants Killed King David? - Shepherds Theological Seminary, https://shepherds.edu/have-the-archaeological-giants-killed-king-david/

27. Joshua as Typology of Christ's Eternal Rest and Inheritance - Pastors.ai, https://pastors.ai/bible/verse/joshua-as-typology-of-christs-eternal-rest-and-inheritance/

28. Why is Joshua called “Jesus” in Hebrews 4:8 in the KJV? | GotQuestions.org, https://www.gotquestions.org/Joshua-Jesus.html

29. Hebrews 4:8 Bible Commentary, https://openbible.com/commentaries/hebrews/4-8.htm

30. For if Jesus had given them rest, then would he not afterward have spoken of another day': an exposition on Paul's words in Hebrews 4:8 | White Throne Ministries, https://whitethroneministries.org/resources/lessons/for-if-jesus-had-given-them-rest-then-would-he-not-afterward-have-spoken-of-another-day-an-exposition-on-pauls-words-in-hebrews-48

31. John Gill's Exposition of the Bible - Hebrews 4:8, https://johngill.thekingsbible.com/CommentaryVerse/58/4/8

32. Topical Bible: Joshua as a Type of Jesus, https://biblehub.com/topical/j/joshua_as_a_type_of_jesus.htm

33. Hebrews 4:8-10 Commentary - Precept Austin, https://www.preceptaustin.org/hebrews_48-10

34. Which day is the "another day" mentioned in Hebrews 4:8?, https://hermeneutics.stackexchange.com/questions/52345/which-day-is-the-another-day-mentioned-in-hebrews-48

35. Feature book review: 'Bound for the Promised Land' - Southern Equip, https://equip.sbts.edu/publications/towers/feature-book-review-bound-for-the-promised-land/

36. Bound for the Promised Land by Oren R. Martin: A Review Article - Ordained Servant: The Orthodox Presbyterian Church, https://opc.org/os.html?article_id=521

37. The Fulfillment of the Land Promise in The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Critique of Dispensationalism - Journal of Biblical and Theological Studies, https://jbtsonline.org/2024/12/the-fulfillment-of-the-land-promise-in-the-epistle-to-the-hebrews-a-critique-of-dispensationalism/

38. Sabbatismos: Does Hebrews 4:9 Teach Rest on the Sabbath? - Life, Hope & Truth, https://lifehopeandtruth.com/bible/10-commandments/sabbath/sabbatismos/

39. Answering the 95 Theses Against Dispensationalism (11) – Theses 41-45 - dr. reluctant, https://drreluctant.wordpress.com/2009/09/02/answering-the-95-theses-against-dispensationalism-11/

40. Progressive Dispensationalism: Continuing the Conversation, https://jbtsonline.org/2025/06/progressive-dispensationalism-continuing-the-conversation/

41. Israel as the People of the Covenant and Dispensationalism: A Biblical Evaluation - Digital Commons @ Andrews University, https://digitalcommons.andrews.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1577&context=jats

42. Ligon Duncan on Covenant Theology vs. Dispensationalism - The Gospel Coalition, https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/podcasts/help-me-teach-the-bible/ligon-duncan-covenant-theology-dispensationalism/